

NONPOINT SOURCE PRIORITY WATERSHEDS LIST**COASTAL WATERS** (17 total; listed geographically, west to east)

Piscataqua estuary Spruce Creek York River Ogunquit River estuary Webhannet River estuary Scarboro River estuary	Royal River estuary Cousins River estuary Harraseeket River estuary Maquoit Bay New Meadows river estuary Medomak River estuary	St. George River estuary Weskeag River Rockland Harbor Union River estuary Machias River estuary
---	--	--

RIVERS & STREAMS (55 total; listed alphabetically by waterway and county; boldfaced entries are highest priority; * denotes community public drinking water supply)

Allagash River, Aroostook Bond Brook, Kennebec Branch Brook, York* Capisic Brook, Cumberland Caribou Stream, Aroostook Carrabassett River, Franklin Chandler Brook, Cumberland Chapman Brook, Oxford* Cobboseecontee Strm, Kennebec Cold River, Oxford Collyer Brook, Cumberland Crooked River, Oxford Daigle Brook, Aroostook Denny's River, Washington Dickey Brook, Aroostook Ducktrap River, Waldo East Machias River, Washington E Br Piscataqua R, Cumberland Fish Brook, Somerset	Frost Gully Strm, Cumberland Great Works River, York Kenduskeag Strm, Penobscot Kennebunk River, York Limestone Stream, Aroostook* Little Androscoggin R., Oxford Little Ossipee River, York Little Madawaska R., Aroostook* Long Creek, Cumberland Machias River, Washington Medomak River, Lincoln Meduxnekeag River, Aroostook Mousam River, York Narraguagus R., Washington Nezinscot River, Oxford Nonesuch River, Cumberland Ossipee River, Cumberland Perley Brook, Aroostook Piscataqua River, Cumberland	Pleasant River, Cumberland Pleasant River, Washington Presque Isle Strm. (incl. North Brk.), Aroostook* Prestile Stream, Aroostook Presumpscot R., Cumberland Royal River, Cumberland Salmon Brook, Aroostook Salmon Falls River, York* Sebasticook River, Somerset Sheepscot River (incl. W. Branch), Lincoln Soudabscook Stream, Penobscot St. George River, Knox Stroudwater River, Cumberland Sunday River, Oxford Togus Stream, Kennebec Union River, Hancock Wesserunsett Stream, Somerset
--	--	--

LAKES (181 total; listed alphabetically; boldfaced entries are highest priority; * denotes community public drinking water supply; town names are included only to identify general pond locations)

Adams Pond, Boothbay* Alamoosook Lake, Orland Alford Lake, Hope Allen Pond, Greene Anasagunticook Lake, Canton* Androscoggin Lake, Leeds Annabessacook Lake, Winthrop Bauneg Beg Pond, Sanford Bay of Naples, Naples Beach Hill Pond, Otis Bear Pond, Hartford Bear Pond, Waterford Beaver Pond, Bridgton Berry Pond, Winthrop Big Indian Pond, St. Albans Big Wood Pond, Jackman* Biscay Pond, Damariscotta	Bonny Eagle Lake, Buxton Boulter Pond, York* Branch Lake, Ellsworth* Branch Pond, China Brettuns Pond, Livermore Buker Pond, Litchfield Bunganut Pond, Lyman Caribou, Egg, Long Pd, Lincoln Carlton Pond, Winthrop* Center Pond, Lincoln Chases Pond, York* Chickawaukie Pond, Rockport China Lake, China* Clary Lake, Whitefield Cobboseecontee L., Winthrop* Cochnewagon Lake, Monmouth Coffee Pond, Casco	Cold Stream Pond, Enfield Coleman Pond, Lincolnville Crawford Pond, Warren Crescent Pond, Raymond Crooked Pond, Lincoln Cross Lake, T17R5 Crystal Lake, Gray Damariscotta Lake, Jefferson* Dexter Pond, Winthrop Dodge Pond, Rangeley Duckpuddle Pond, Waldoboro Dyer Long Pond, Jefferson East Pond, Smithfield Echo Lake, Presque Isle Echo Lake, Readfield Ellis Pond, Roxbury Estes Lake, Sanford
--	--	--

NONPOINT SOURCE PRIORITY WATERSHEDS LIST

PRIORITY LAKES (CONTINUED)

Flying Pond, Vienna Folly Pond, Kittery* Folly Pond, Vinalhaven* Forest Lake, Windham Fresh Pond, North Haven* Grassy Pond, Rockport* Great Moose Lake, Hartland Great Pond, Belgrade Green Lake, Ellsworth Haley Pond, Rangeley Halls Pond, Hebron* Hancock Pond, Embden* Hancock Pond, Denmark Hermon Pond, Hermon Highland Lake, Windham Highland Lake, Bridgton Hogan Pond, Oxford Holland Pond, Limerick Horne Pond, Limington Hosmer Pond, Camden Ingalls Pond, Bridgton Island Pond, Waterford Kennebunk Pond, Lyman Keoka Lake, Waterford Knickerbocker Pond, Boothbay Lake Auburn, Auburn* Little Cobbosseecontee L. Winthrop Little Ossipee, Waterboro Little Pennessseewassee, Norway Little Pond, Damariscotta* Little Sebago, Windham Little Wilson Pond, Turner Long Lake, Bridgton Long Lake, T17 R4 WELS Long Pond, Belgrade & Rome Long Pond, Bucksport Long Pond, Southwest Harbor* Long Pond, Waterford Lovejoy Pond, Wayne Lower Narrows Pond, Winthrop Lower Range Pond, Poland Madawaska Lake, Westmanland Maranacook Lake, Winthrop Mattanawcook Pond, Lincoln	McGrath Pond, Oakland Meduxnekeag Lake, Oakfield Megunticook Lake, Lincolnville Messalonskee Lake, Sidney Middle Pond, Kittery* Middle Range Pond, Poland Mirror Lake, Rockport* Moose Hill Pd., Livermore Falls* Moose Pond, Sweden Mount Blue Pond, Avon* Mousam Lake, Shapleigh Nequasset Lake, Woolwich* Nokomis Pond, Newport* No Name Pond, Lewiston North Pond, Norway North Pond, Smithfield North Pond, Sumner* North Pond, Warren Norton Pond, Lincolnville Notched Pond, Raymond Otter Pond, Bridgton Panther Pond, Raymond Paradise Pond, Damariscotta Parker Pond, Casco Parker Pond, Vienna Parker Pond, Jay* Pattee Pond, Winslow Peabody Pond, Sebago Pemaquid Pond, Waldoboro Pennessseewassee Lake, Norway Phillips Lake, Dedham Pleasant Lake, Otisfield Pleasant Pond, Richmond Pleasant Pond, Turner Pleasant Pond, T4 R3 WELS Pocasset Lake, Wayne Pushaw Lake, Orono Quimby Pond, Rangeley Raymond Pond, Raymond Roberts Wadley Pond, Lyman Round Pond (Little), Lincoln Sabattus Pond, Sabattus Sabbathday L, New Gloucester	Saint Froid Lake, Eagle Lake* Saint George Lake, Liberty Salmon Lake, Belgrade Salmon Pond, Dover-Foxcroft* Sand Pond, Monmouth Sand Pond, Denmark Sebago Lake, Sebago* Sebasticook Lake, Newport Sennebec Pond, Union Seven Tree Pond, Warren Shaker Pond, Alfred Silver Lake, Bucksport* South Pond, Warren Spectacle Pond, Vassalboro Square Pond, Acton Starbird Pond, Hartland* Swan Lake, Swanville Swan Pond, Lyman Taylor Pond, Auburn Thomas Pond, Casco Thompson Lake, Oxford Threecornered Pond, Augusta Threemile Pond, Windsor Togus Pond, Augusta Torsey Pd., Mt. Vernon & Readfield Trickey Pond, Naples Tripp Pond, Poland Unity Pond, Unity Upper Narrows Pd, Winthrop* Upper Range Pond, Poland Varnum Pond, Wilton* Ward Pond, Sidney Wassookeag Lake, Dexter* Watchic Pond, Standish Webber Pond, Vassalboro West Harbor Pond, Boothbay Hbr Whitney Pond, Oxford Wilson Lake, Acton Wilson Pond, Wilton Wilson Pond, Wayne Wood Pond, Bridgton Woodbury Pond, Monmouth Young Lake, Mars Hill*
---	--	--

Nonpoint Source Priority Watersheds

Background

“An Act to Protect the States Lakes, Rivers, and Coastal Wetlands through a Comprehensive Watershed Protection Program” was enacted by the 118th Legislature and became effective in September 1997 (Public Law 1997 Chapter 519). The law authorizes the Maine Land and Water Resources Council (MLWRC) to “create, implement, and administer a comprehensive watershed protection program in order to ensure the development and implementation of locally supported watershed management plans.” The law directs the Council to coordinate the activities of agencies involved in watershed management. One of the required activities of these agencies is to establish *priorities* for the purpose of directing resources to the management of water bodies based on:

- A. An assessment of their value;
- B. The degree of threat or impairment to water quality, and aquatic habitat due to nonpoint source pollution;
- C. The likelihood of meeting watershed management objectives; and
- D. The degree of public support in the watershed for watershed management.

The Maine Watershed Management Committee (MWMC) was formed to advise the MLWRC on priority watersheds and to ensure that watershed management activities are coordinated amongst the participating agencies and organizations. Membership in the MWMC includes State and Federal agencies, as well as private organizations that have a state-wide interest in watershed management (membership list attached). In 1997, the MWMC established work groups, which developed proposed lists of NPS priority watersheds in Maine based on the criteria listed above.

Significance of the “NPS Priority Watersheds” List

The fundamental objective of the List is to identify waters to help direct NPS water pollution control efforts. It is important to note that the list of NPS priority watersheds does not include all important waterbodies in the State of Maine. Listed waterbodies have both significant value from a regional or statewide perspective, and water quality that is either impaired, or threatened to some degree due to nonpoint source water pollution from land use activities in the watershed.

Local groups that are developing or implementing watershed management plans in “NPS Priority Watersheds” are likely to receive additional technical assistance from State and Federal agencies. The MWMC anticipates that each year several watersheds within this list will be targeted for interagency watershed management actions. For example, staff from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) will be available to assist local volunteers organize and carry out watershed surveys to determine the sources of water pollution in the watershed.

Financial assistance for groups developing or implementing watershed management plans and activities is made available through a grant program administered by the DEP. For the past several years, the DEP has awarded approximately \$500,000 from federal Clean Water Act 319(h) funds for implementing projects to reduce nonpoint source pollution. In 1998, that amount is being supplemented by an additional \$500,000 from the bond issue approved by Maine voters in June. While these funds are not limited to just designated NPS Priority Watersheds, preference will generally be given to projects in those watersheds, based on approval criteria set forth in the law (38MRSA § 2013).

Coastal Waters Evaluation Process

The MWMC used criteria for water quality and ecological/economic values described below to create the set of priority areas that will be considered priorities for watershed management grants. The MWMC will use the feasibility and local support criteria to select specific projects from this list that will receive staff support from State agencies.

Threatened or Impaired Water Quality

Priority coastal waters have documented water quality problems or threats, as defined below.

Bacterial Contamination

Bacteria is a public health concern because certain bacteria can cause illness or even death. People are exposed to bacteria by eating shellfish or swimming in coastal waters. State water classification law defines acceptable levels of bacteria in coastal waters using an indicator bacteria. The state standards are based on the National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP) administered by the Food and Drug Administration. The Committee recommends that priority be given to areas that meet the following guidelines, based on NSSP administered in Maine by the Department of Marine Resources (DMR): *Areas closed to shellfish harvesting after 1-2" rain event; Areas closed to shellfish harvesting with known nonpoint sources of bacteria; Areas open to shellfish harvesting with relatively higher amount of development anticipated in the watershed.*

Dissolved Oxygen

Just as oxygen in the air is vital to the terrestrial ecosystem, dissolved oxygen in coastal waters is vital to the marine ecosystem. The effects of low dissolved oxygen have been found in Maine where large numbers of marine organisms have died simultaneously (e.g., menhaden, softshell clams). State water classification law includes standards for dissolved oxygen, but these standards are considered by experts to be outdated and inappropriate. The State is currently working to revise this standards based on international research and local testing. DEP has tested some coastal waters for dissolved oxygen, and this effort has recently been augmented by volunteer monitoring groups along the coast. Based on the research and data collected in Maine, the Committee recommends that coastal waters that have *Dissolved Oxygen concentration less than 5.5 ppm* be considered a priority.

Toxic Contamination

Toxic effects of chemicals in the marine environment are often difficult to identify. The key to understanding toxicity is knowing the relationship between the harmful effect, the dose and exposure. Much of this relationship is still not understood in the marine community. There has been some research, however, that allows us to make general statements about this relationship. While not all places have been tested for toxic contamination, some data is available and has been compiled by DEP. The Committee proposes that priority be given to places where *toxic contamination is a significant risk to benthic organisms*, based on national research, and to places where *toxic contamination significantly exceeds background levels for Maine*, based on state research.

Ecological and Economic Values

While the economic and ecological values are not quantified for most of the coast, the Dept. of Marine Resources has made its best judgment on these values based on the information available. DMR has identified places that have commercial harvesting high potential for shellfish and other marine species such as lobsters, eels, and worms. DMR has also ranked the ecological value of these places as high, medium or low. Priority is given to places that have *identified commercial harvesting potential and high or medium ecological value.*

Stormwater Rule

The recently adopted Stormwater Management law directed DEP to identify watersheds most at risk from development which would then be under the jurisdiction of the law. Seven coastal watersheds were identified by DEP rule (06-096 CMR Ch. 500). Two of the watersheds most at risk did not make the priority list for watershed management, however, because they do not meet the ecological value criteria. However, these two areas are included on the priority list since they have identified water quality problems and are targeted for stormwater regulation.

Basis for coastal waters listed as priorities

Coastal Water	Basis
1. Piscataqua estuary	Toxic; commercial marine resources; med. eco value
2. Spruce Creek	bacteria; DO; toxic; comm. mar. resource; stormwater rule
3. York River	DO; commercial marine resources; med. eco value
4. Ogunquit River estuary	bacteria; DO; shellfish; med. eco value
5. Webhannet River estuary	bacteria; DO ; shellfish; stormwater rule
6. Scarboro River estuary	bacteria; toxic; comm. marine resources; high eco value
7. Royal River estuary	bacteria; commercial marine resources; med. eco value
8. Cousins River estuary	bacteria; commercial marine resources; med. eco value
9. Harraseeket River estuary	bacteria; commercial marine resources; med. eco value
10. Maquoit Bay	bacteria; commercial marine resources; med. eco value
11. New Meadows river estuary	bacteria; DO; toxic; comm. mar. resource; high eco value
12. Medomak River estuary	bacteria; DO; comm. marine resources; high eco value
13. St. George River estuary	bacteria; DO; comm. marine resources; high eco value
14. Weskeag River	bacteria; DO; shellfish; stormwater rule
15. Rockland Harbor	bacteria; toxic; comm. marine resources; med. eco value
16. Union River estuary	bacteria; comm. marine resources; med. eco value
17. Machias river estuary	bacteria; comm. marine resources; high eco value

Rivers & Streams Evaluation Process

The tremendous range in the size of river and stream watersheds makes the task of developing a priority list especially difficult. From a state-wide perspective, the value of a resource tends to increase with its size; i.e., a major river has more state-wide significance than a small, unnamed stream. These larger rivers also tend to garner more public support. On the other hand, small streams are the most sensitive to nonpoint pollution. The smaller watersheds of these streams makes it more feasible to conduct watershed management activities with the prospect of achieving measureable improvement in water quality. For many streams, however, data on water quality is lacking.

Larger streams and smaller rivers are favored as priorities where they are large enough to have a constituency, but small enough to be manageable with respect to conducting watershed management activities. In a few cases in urban settings, smaller streams are included because of their higher level of impairment and the potential to benefit a relatively large population within the watershed by improving the water quality. On the other end of the spectrum, some larger rivers were also selected due to significant impairments. Also, those rivers designated under the Atlantic Salmon Conservation Plan were also included as priorities.

Rivers and streams designated as highest priority were selected on the basis of on-going protection or restoration work; e.g., Atlantic Salmon rivers; or on the basis of their not attaining water quality standards.

Basis for rivers and streams listed as priorities (boldfaced entries are highest priority)

River or Stream Name, County	Basis
1. Allagash River, Aroostook	Fisheries, recreation, threat of sedimentation
2. Bond Brook, Kennebec	Cold water fishery, sed; non-attainment w/ classif.stds
3. Branch Brook, York	Public drinking water supply, threatened
4. Capisic Brook, Cumberland	Sed., nut., low DO; bact.; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
5. Caribou Stream, Aroostook	Ag, dev; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
6. Carrabassett River, Franklin	Cold water fishery; Sed.
7. Chandler Brook, Cumberland	Sed., nutrients; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
8. Chapman Brook, Oxford	Public drinking water supply, threatened
9. Cobbosseecontee Stream, Kennebec	High value fishery pot.; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
10. Cold River, Oxford	Sed., nut.
11. Collyer Brook, Cumberland	Sed., bact.
12. Crooked River, Oxford	Threatened; sed., nut
13. Daigle Brook, Aroostook	Agric., forestry, non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
14. Denny's River, Washington	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Conservation
15. Dickey Brook, Aroostook	Agriculture, roads, non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
16. Ducktrap River, Waldo	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Conservation
17. East Machias River, Washington	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Conservation
18. East Br., Piscataqua R., Cumberland	Sed.,nut.; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
19. Fish Brook, Somerset	Agric., riparian loss; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
20. Frost Gully Stream, Cumberland	Pot. high value in urban setting, non-attainment
21. Great Works River, York	Low DO; agric.; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
22. Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot	Agricultural; dev.;non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
23. Kennebunk River, York	Sed.,nut.,bac.
24. Limestone Stream, Aroostook	Public drinking water supply, threatened
25. Little Androscoggin R., Oxford,Andro.	Urban,resid., ag.,forestry;non-attain. w/ classif.stds.
26. Little Ossipee River, York	High value, threatened; sed., nut.
27. Little Madawaska River, Aroostook	Public drinking water; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
28. Long Creek, Cumberland	Potential high value in urban setting, sed.,nut.

Basis for rivers and streams (continued)

29. Machias River, Washington	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Conservation
30. Medomak River, Lincoln	Bacteria; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
31. Meduxnekeag River, Aroostook	Ag., forestry, dev; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
32. Mousam River, York	Sed., nut., bact.
33. Narraguagus River, Washington	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Cons.; non-attain.
34. Nezinscot River, Oxford, Androscoggin	Cold water fishery; agric.
35. Nonesuch River, Cumberland	Sed., nut.
36. Ossipee River, Cumberland, York	Threatened; sed., nut.
37. Perley Brook, Aroostook	Agric., development.
38. Piscataqua River, Cumberland	Low DO, colored water; non-attainment
39. Pleasant River, Cumberland	Cold water fisherynear relatively populated area
40. Pleasant River, Washington	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Conservation
41. Presque Isle St.(incl. No. Br.), Aroostook	Agric., constituency, non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
42. Prestile Stream, Aroostook	Cold water fishery; Ag, dev.;non-attain. w/ classif.stds.
43. Presumpscot River, Cumberland	Sediment, nutrients; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
44. Royal River Cumberland	Cold water fishery, sed., nut.; non-attainment
45. Salmon Brook, Aroostook	Agriculture
46. Salmon Falls River, York	Severe eutrophication, both point and NPS.; non-attain.
47. Sebastcook, Somerset, Waldo, Kennebec	Dev, agriculture; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
48. Sheepscot R., incl. West Br., Lincoln	Priority for Atlantic Salmon Cons.,non-attainment
49. Soudabscook Stream, Penobscot	Development
50. St George River, Knox	Cold water fishery; sed., nut.
51. Stroudwater River, Cumberland	Sed., nut., bact.; non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
52. Sunday River, Oxford	Sed., increased flows
53. Togus Stream, Kennebec	Cold water fishery, non-attainment w/ classif.stds.
54. Union River, Hancock	Development
55. Wesserunsett Stream, Somerset	Sediment

Lakes Evaluation Process

A Lakes Work group was formed consisting of water resource professional staff from DEP knowledgeable in statewide lakes management issues. The work group used best professional judgment to sort through and evaluate relevant information.. Given the relatively subjective nature of these criteria, the wide range of physical, biological, and land use & cover information on lakes and associated watersheds, and the incomplete informational coverage on lakes, the work group concluded that a quantitative evaluation procedure would be impractical.

Maine has 5785 lakes and ponds. 2,314 lakes make up 97%+ of the total lake area. A subset was selected consisting of all lakes greater than 50 acres in size that appeared on at least one of the following lists: lakes that are on record at DHS as primary water supplies, Lakes at Risk as defined under the new Stormwater Regulations, lakes originally considered for the Lakes at Risk list that were predicted as having a 1ppb increase in phosphorus within the next 35 years, lakes on DEP's prior NPS priority waters list, lakes listed as not attaining water quality standards, lakes having an outstanding fishery as defined by the Maine's Finest Lakes Report, and lakes considered to be impaired from known sources. This selection procedure resulted in 388 lakes to be considered.

Based on assessment of relative resource values and level of NPS threat, the 388 lakes were sorted into one of 4 categories

1. High priority for watershed management activity
2. Medium priority for watershed management activity
3. Medium priority for watershed management activity if clustered with higher priority lakes
4. Low priority for watershed management activity

In order to assess relative resource values and level of NPS threat, the following information was considered:

1. watershed land use;
2. surface area;
3. mean depth;
4. water quality category;
5. lakes volunteer monitoring data evaluated for sensitivity to change in water quality due to increase in pollutant loads;
6. years estimated until noticeable change in trophic state;
7. threatened/impaired status (blooms, low hypolimnetic DO, deteriorating trophic trend);
8. water quality trend data;
9. Lakes at Risk list adopted under the Stormwater Management Law;
10. weighted growth factor for watershed;
11. lakes not attaining water quality standards (303(d) list);
12. DEP 1990 NPS Priority Waters list;
13. geographic location, proximity to large populations;
14. degree to which the lake serves as a community focal point;
15. regional value (Is there a roughly equivalent alternate lake resource for people to use in the area?);
16. statewide significance;
17. level of public use;
18. public water supply;
19. cold water fishery (IF&W data);
20. outstanding fishery (per Maine's Finest Lakes report).

After sorting all 388 into the 4 categories, the work group met to reconsider, review, and discuss the information on all category "1" and "2" lakes to develop the recommendation for the priority watersheds

list. The Lakes with "1" and "2" ratings were compared to verify general relative appropriateness of assigned ratings. Then the work group discussed whether there was sufficient technical feasibility and at least a good potential for effective local support for watershed management actions in each of the category "1" lakes.

In order to assess relative technical feasibility for managing the watershed over years to gain significant protection or detectable restoration of water quality, the following issues were considered:

1. DEP lakes management experience in that specific lake and watershed;
2. land cover and human land use distribution in the watershed;
3. estimate of cost and time to achieve the gain in water quality;
4. estimate of magnitude of water quality benefits that could be realized.

In order to assess relative potential for public support, the work group did consider the prospect that a critical mass of constituency exists in the watershed to potentially assume the role of proactive watershed stewardship.

In October 1997, the lakes work group recommended that 41 lakes denoted as category #1 be included in the NPS priority watersheds list.

Response to Comments

In June 1998, the MWMC asked the lakes work group to reconsider the list based on comments received. Comments included concern over the lack of public water supplies on the list and concern that based on geographic area of all watersheds included, lakes are under-represented on the list compared to rivers and streams, particularly since lakes are collectively more sensitive to pollution since they act as sinks collecting nutrients and other contaminants.

Upon further review, the lakes work group recommended:

- Expansion of the lakes list to include those previously listed as category 2 and 3 (medium priority for watershed management activity) in order to encourage more aggressive watershed stewardship activity in those watersheds;
- Expansion of the lakes list to include community public water supplies, except for those whose watersheds are predominantly controlled by the water district and those scheduled to be replaced by ground water sources;
- Elevation of the original 41 lakes listed as category 1 to "highest priority".

Summary of Listing Basis

All lakes on the NPS list have water quality that is either impaired, or threatened to some degree due to nonpoint source water pollution from land use activities in the watershed and have significant value from a regional perspective. In addition, forty-one lakes listed as "higher priority" have significant value from a statewide perspective. The entire list consists of 180 lakes out of a total of 2314 significant lakes in Maine.

Basis for lakes listed as "highest priority"

Lake, Town	Basis:
1. Adams Pond, Boothbay	blooms; marginal wq; high growth; water supply, limited alternatives.
2. Androscoggin Lake, Leeds	marginal wq; high growth; high use; outstanding fishery
3. Annabessacook, Winthrop	blooms; high use; outstanding fishery;
4. Bauneg beg Pond, Sanford	marginal wq; high growth; limited regional alternatives
5. China Lake, China	blooms; water supply; high use; limited regional alternatives
6. Cobboscontee lake, Winthrop	blooms; water supply; high use; limited regional alternatives; outstanding fishery

**Basis for lakes listed as
"highest priority" (cont.)**

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 7. Cold Stream Pond, Enfield | high growth; sensitive to change; exceptional clarity; limited regional alternatives; outstanding fishery. |
| 8. Cross Lake, T17 R5 | blooms, threat to Square lake; high use; important fishery |
| 9. Damariscotta lake, Jefferson | marginal wq; high growth; high use; state park; limited regional alternatives; outstanding fishery; |
| 10. Forest Lake, Windham | marginal wq, sensitive to change; very high growth; proximity to large populations |
| 11. Great Pond, Belgrade | trend declining wq; limited regional alternatives; outstanding fishery. |
| 12. Highland Lake, Windham | marginal wq, sensitive to change; very high growth; proximity to large populations |
| 13. Highland Lake, Bridgton | bloom, marginal wq, sensitive to change; community focal point; |
| 14. Lake Auburn, Auburn | sensitive to change; water supply; outstanding fishery |
| 15. Little Ossipee, Waterboro | sensitive to change, high growth; limited regional alternatives; high use; important fishery |
| 16. Little Sebago, Windham | marginal wq; sensitive to change; proximity to large populations; |
| 17. Long Lake, Bridgton | high growth; limited regional alternatives; community focal point; high use |
| 18. Lower Range Pond, Poland | marginal wq, severe DO depletion; sensitive to change; high growth; high use; state park; proximity to large population |
| 19. Madawaska LakeWestmanland | blooms, limited regional alternatives |
| 20. Maranacook, Winthrop | marginal wq, severe DO depletion; sensitive to change; community focal point, high use; outstanding fishery |
| 21. Megunticook, Lincolnville | marginal wq; high growth; high use; limited regional alternatives; |
| 22. Messalonskee, Sidney | high P levels; high growth; high use, |
| 23. Middle Range Pond, Poland | marginal wq, severe DO depletion; sensitive to change; high growth; high use; proximity to large population |
| 24. Mousam Lake, Shapleigh | deteriorating trend; high growth; high use; limited regional alternatives |
| 25. Nequasset Pond, Woolwich | sensitive to change; water supply, limited alternatives |
| 26. Pennesseewassee Lake, Norway | sensitive to change; high use, limited regional alternatives, proximity to large population |
| 27. Pleasant Pond, Richmond | blooms; limited regional alternatives; high use; state park |
| 28. Pushaw Lake, Orono | marginal wq; high use; proximity to large population; limited regional alternatives |
| 29. Sabattus Pond, Sabattus | blooms; high growth; limited regional alternatives |
| 30. Sabbathday Lake, New Gloucester | sensitive to change; high growth; close proximity to large population |
| 31. Sebago Lake, Sebago | high growth, state significance; water supply; outstanding clarity; high use, state park; outstanding fishery |
| 32. Sebeccook, Newport | blooms; limited regional alternatives; high use; community focal point, |
| 33. Swan Lake, Swanville | sensitive to change; high growth; limited regional alternative; state park; important fishery |
| 34. Taylor Pond, Auburn | marginal wq; sensitive to change; high growth; proximity to large population |
| 35. Thompson Lake, Oxford | sensitive to change; high growth; exceptional clarity; outstanding fishery |
| 36. Threemile Pond, China | severely blooming; |
| 37. Trickey Pond, Naples | sensitive to change; high growth; exceptional clarity. |
| 38. Unity Pond, Unity | blooms; sensitive to change; limited regional alternative |
| 39. Upper Narrows Pond, Winthrop | sensitive to change; high growth; water supply |
| 40. Upper Range Pond, Poland | marginal wq, severe DO depletion; sensitive to change; high growth; high use; proximity to large population |
| 41. Webber Pond, Vassalboro | severely blooming |